THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 150 NEW YORK : SATURDAY : JUNE 15, 1940 NUMBER 24

The Shape of Things

AS WE GO TO PRESS, THE GERMAN ARMY IS almost as close to Paris as it was in 1914 before the Battle of the Marne turned the tide. But this time there is as yet no sign of a weak spot in the German line of the kind into which Joffre hurled his reserves in the last war. On the other hand, the French army remains intact and is exacting a heavy price for every yard of ground it yields. The most dangerous Nazi advance is the thrust across the Seine between Rouen and Paris, which threatens both to outflank the capital and to envelop the British and French forces in Normandy. Whether the movement can be completed seems to depend on German ability to maintain pressure at its present intensity. Hitler is expending men and material recklessly, and the extent of his reserve of both seems to have far exceeded the calculation of the Allied command. But there must be some limit, some point of exhaustion. If the stonewalling tactics of Weygand can once check the impetus of the German drive, Paris may be saved. But the prospects are admittedly dark, and while the loss of its capital and chief industrial center would not necessarily put France out of the war, it would alarmingly diminish the nation's power of resistance.

*

TWO SPEECHES WERE DELIVERED LAST Monday—one in Rome and one in Charlottesville, Virginia. Those who heard both must have been struck by the contrast. From the portentous balcony of the Palazzo Venezia came a declaration of war embodied in staccato, theatrical boasts and threats. "Clad in shining blackmail," as the *New Statesman and Nation* so beautifully described him, Mussolini proclaimed Italy's unbending adherence to sacred obligations, its determination to meet the supreme trial, and its intention to get a fat slice of the booty when the conquest of France and Britain is complete. He promised not to attack other nations or their possessions bordering on Italy "by sea or land," ruling out specifically Switzerland, Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, and Egypt. This promise is undoubtedly an effort to placate the two powers which most strongly oppose the extension of the war into Eastern Europe—Soviet Russia and the Vatican. Whether it can be kept, the next days will tell. Mussolini may also hope to keep Turkey and possibly Egypt out of the war by directing his attack toward the west, but it is more probable that he is counting on a German victory so swift as to spare him the necessity of a long struggle on any front. And he is gambling his country's whole future on Hitler's comradely willingness to reward him for his services first as a non-belligerent ally and now as a fellow-warrior. "When one has a friend," said Il Duce, "one marches with him to the end." But one does not begin marching, it seems, until one calculates that the end is very near.

*

FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA CAME a different voice, speaking soberly but with immense eloquence of the straits in which democracy today finds itself. The President's words mark a new phase of relationship of this country to the struggle in Europe. Plainly he warned the United States of the consequences of an Allied defeat; almost as plainly he warned the Fascists that the extension of the war might bring the United States in. He promised that the material resources of the nation would be put at the disposal of the opponents of "force and hate," while at the same time the United States would speed up its preparations for "every emergency" and for its own defense. These are strong words, but the reception of the President's speech should end any question whether the American people support his determination to give all possible aid to the Allies. The decision to send planes and arms from our army and navy reserves was the most realistic defense measure of the past week. We do not believe it was necessary to adopt the subterfuge—which deceived no one—of selling these machines to private manufacturers for immediate shipment to France and Britain; now that the President has clearly aligned the country on the side of "those beyond seas maintaining their battle for freedom," Congress and the Administration ought to be able to agree on a straightforward policy.

Published weekly and copyright, 1940, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 18, 1897, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ITEMS CULLED FROM THE RUSSIAN PRESS during the past three weeks point to a Soviet foreign policy with the flexibility of an amoeba. Caustic references are made to "defeatist elements" in high places in the Allied forces, but when appeasers are routed out *Red Star* reports that "the wave of arrests and shake-ups in the army in France and England bespeaks the growth of a capitulatory mood"—a mood, incidentally, which Communists in those countries do their utmost to induce. Tributes to the brilliant evacuation of Flanders are diluted with sour remarks that "British imperialism . . . attempts to compensate for a military defeat by reactionary measures within the country." Against the Italians a steady drumfire of hostility and scorn has been maintained, but on the eve of Italy's long-delayed plunge into the war diplomatic relations with Rome were renewed. This step, coupled with some relaxation of border tensions in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Rumania during the past two weeks, implies an understanding between Quirinal and Kremlin by which peace is to be maintained in the Balkans and Italian attention directed west and south. This does not necessarily mean that Russia is interested in seeing France quickly crushed, but only that its chief interest is in keeping the war at a distance. But if there was such an agreement it was a green light to Italy and to that extent heightened the chances of a quick German victory. To offset this perilous development it would not be surprising to see the Soviets embark on another adventure in the Baltic area. Grievances against Lithuania are being cultivated and may serve their purpose shortly. In this connection the agreement signed with Japan over the demarcation of the Mongolian-Manchoukuoan frontier is worth noting. An armistice with Japan ended hostilities over this same issue on September 16, 1939; the Red Army marched into Poland on the seventeenth.

✳

THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE has enlarged the original tax program and has approved imposts which it estimates will raise a billion dollars in new revenue. Most controversial, perhaps, is its proposal to lower income-tax personal exemption from $1,000 to $800 for single persons and from $2,500 to $2,000 for married persons. This provision, if adopted, would add 2,000,000 persons to the tax rolls and yield $82,500,000, most of which, however, would come from larger payments by present taxpayers. The actual return from those whose incomes have hitherto been below tax level would be very small and might fail to cover the additional cost of collection. Nevertheless, this proposal is being widely, and rather smugly, defended on the ground that payment of direct taxes would be morally healthy for persons with small incomes. This argument would sound less phony if it included proposals to diminish indirect taxes, which fall far more heavily, in proportion to income, on the poor than on the well-to-do. In fact, however, the program under consideration provides for a general increase in indirect taxes. So far it does not include any levy on excess profits, but according to Representative Doughton, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, this may come later. No doubt we shall be told that large incomes are already taxed to the limit. But it must be remembered that while a surtax rate of 73 per cent on an income of $1,000,000 sounds high it is not necessarily an effective rate. There are still many more or less legal methods of tax-dodging, not to mention the snug harbor for millionaires afforded by tax-free bonds.

✳

WILLIAM GREEN KNIFED AMERICAN LABOR when he joined forces with its worst enemies to push the Smith amendments through the House of Representatives. These bills, as the A. F. of L. Executive Council recognized a few months ago, do more than amend the Wagner Act. They transform it into an effective means of discouraging collective bargaining and of oppressing labor. The thirty pieces of silver which passed in this transaction took the form of an additional amendment permitting a craft unit to bargain for itself irre-

CONTENTS

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 721

EDITORIALS:

A DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM OF DEFENSE by Freda Kirchwey 723

PATRIOTISM PLUS 724

LABOR'S FRONT LINE 725

WHERE TRADE MEANS SAFETY by Charles E. Noyes 726

MEN WHO WOULD BE PRESIDENT

VIII. HULL CAN WAIT by Barnet Nover 729

THE CASE FOR BERTRAND RUSSELL by John Dewey 732

IN THE WIND 733

ISSUES AND MEN by Oswald Garrison Villard 734

BOOKS AND THE ARTS:

PLANNING FOR WAR by Lindsay Rogers 735

ANATOMY OF POLAND by Mildred Adams 736

ADVENTUROUS AMERICANS by Joseph Wood Krutch 736

LIBERAL—SOUTHERN STYLE by John Temple Graves 737

DRAMA: THE NAUGHTY SIXTEEN-NINETIES by Joseph Wood Krutch 739

RECORDS by B. H. Haggin 739

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER

Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART I. F. STONE

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MURIEL C. GRAY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spective of the wishes of a majority of the men in the whole plant or industry. In return for this dangerous and dubious privilege, Green threw his support to a series of amendments that would butcher the Wagner Act to make a corporation lawyer's holiday. The present Labor Board would be abolished. Workers in agricultural processing industries would lose the protection of the Wagner Act entirely. Employers could refuse to negotiate with a union headed by an alien—a blow at Bridges's Longshoremen and Pritchett's Woodworkers. Any worker who could be proved guilty of "violence" would lose his right to reinstatement. The Labor Board's procedure would be hopelessly entangled in technical rules, and all its findings and actions could be reviewed in interminable litigation. We cannot believe that the Administration will permit the Smith amendments to pass the Senate, although the vote cast for them by Majority Leader Rayburn in the House may be a danger signal. The A. F. of L. rank and file, as Representative Mary Norton protested during the debate, has been sold down the river by its leadership. It had better make itself heard quickly, for passage of the Smith amendments by the Senate would be a calamity.

*

WE DON'T LIKE DISAGREEING WITH FELIX Frankfurter, whose social wisdom has been tempered and tested in many honorable battles. But we are forced to join Justice Stone in dissenting from the opinion read by Justice Frankfurter last week in the Jehovah's Witnesses flag-salute case. The flag is, indeed, as the majority held, the symbol of our national unity, and that unity "is the basis of national security." But the unity itself is based upon the free will of free men, and the maintenance of that unity by compulsion, even if it were possible, would rob it of value. A girl of twelve and her brother aged ten refused to salute the flag in a Minersville, Pennsylvania, public school because the sect to which they belong, Jehovah's Witnesses, takes literally the Biblical injunction "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. . . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them." They were expelled. Are we honoring the flag by punishing two small children because their conscience—or even their parents' conscience—will not permit them to salute it? Do we further national unity by exacting under penalty what is worthless unless freely given? Justice Stone covered himself with honor by his dissent. "History teaches us," he said, "that there have been few infringements of personal liberty by the state which have not been justified, as they are here, in the name of righteousness and the public good, and few which have not been directed, as they are now, at politically helpless minorities." It is disturbing to find that his colleagues are in need of so elementary a lecture.

ALL NORWAY IS NOW IN GERMAN HANDS. The Allies have withdrawn their forces from the Narvik region, and the Norwegian troops in the north have been instructed to lay down their arms. Abandonment of this campaign, only a few days after Narvik town had been captured, is clearly the result not of local military defeat but of the necessity for concentrating all resources on the western front and in the Mediterranean. In order to hold northern Norway larger numbers of planes and anti-aircraft guns than could well be spared would have been needed in face of the constant Nazi pressure. Even more decisive, perhaps, in view of Italy's entrance into the war, was the fact that the operations in Norway required the protection of important units of the British fleet. As it is, the withdrawal has involved severe naval losses, for the aircraft carrier Glorious, two destroyers, a large transport, and a tanker were trapped in northern waters by two German battleships and sunk. Thus proof is furnished of the help afforded to the German navy by control of the Norwegian coast and of the added difficulties of the Allies in maintaining a tight blockade.

A Democratic Program of Defense

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

A GREAT and expanding defense program is being built in Washington. It has been forced on an unwilling country by the pressure of monstrous events. Our people have always and properly feared the effects of militarization. We have known that military might and democratic freedom are uneasy partners. In the past we have—almost without thinking about it—opposed a large standing army and compulsory service. We are a civilian nation, and we have taken our security for granted, putting trust in our great ocean barriers rather than in strength of arms.

Today this complacent confidence is gone. It is buried in the ruins of Dunkerque. America is arming. The defense program faces no opposition that counts. Four billion dollars looks like, and is, a small price to pay for protection against Hitler's plans of world dominion. It is only a small fraction of the amount we shall have to pay in cash and living standards and human values if Hitler crushes France and Britain. We are arming, and the only question is how much of our democratic freedom will be able to survive our preparations to defend it.

In the days when a big, but one-ocean, navy and a small army seemed an adequate defense, nobody worried much about the relationship between democracy and defense. Our army and navy are not democratic organizations; they are rigid hierarchies of rank, concentrating

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and exaggerating the social distinctions that exist in civil life. But each is a separate society, cut off as in no other country from the general community. And the whole armed force is so small and so scattered that its social influence is insignificant. No officer caste claims powers and privileges superior to those of the ordinary citizen. The organization of the army has been a matter of indifference to most civilian Americans.

That can no longer be the case. Our preparations for defense, both economic and military, will affect the life of every one of us. Methods that were harmless in a small military establishment will be intolerable when the navy is greatly increased and the army doubled. The shift toward a war economy has begun. And already the threats inherent in the new order are starting to materialize.

Some of them are discussed this week in the editorials that follow. Assured high profits for the makers of arms and planes and tanks; threats to labor standards and labor's right to organize and bargain collectively—these are only hints of what is likely to follow in due course. In a series of editorial articles in this and later issues *The Nation* plans to take up the major problems that challenge those who want a genuinely democratic defense, who are determined that our national effort shall not be turned into a travesty of the institutions it is devised to protect.

The first requisite for a democratic program of defense is universal military training. This is a hard prescription for me to write, and it will be an unpalatable dose for many readers to swallow. Universal service, in the lexicon of liberals, has meant just one thing—state coercion of the individual. But new conditions demand the fresh examination of old dogmas. A small army could safely be a volunteer army. A large army must be based on the training and service of all citizens if it is to avoid military and class discrimination.

Already steps have been taken to dragoon the unemployed into the service. An amendment providing for "non-combatant military training" of members of the Civilian Conservation Corps—some 500,000 young men a year—was attached to the new relief bill by a Senate subcommittee on appropriations. Senator Byrnes has introduced a bill to train 1,000,000 men in "non-combat" subjects essential to the operations of the army and navy. This civilian corps would be recruited by the CCC and the NYA and trained by army and navy experts. Just the other day the State Director of Relief in New Jersey went to the shocking length of ordering that relief be withheld from single persons eligible for military service and that such persons be "required" to enlist.

This whole tendency is dangerous. Its logical result can only be an army recruited from the ranks of the unemployed under an officer class made up of West Point graduates and the products of the ROTC. No form of military organization could be more crudely undemocratic, more certain to encourage class distinctions and create discontent. By all means give military training, combatant as well as non-combatant, to young men in the CCC and to fit men on the relief rolls, but give it in equal doses to college students and employed workers and embryo stockbrokers. If training is properly planned to get the best possible results in improved physical stamina, in skill and self-reliance, as well as in military technique, it will benefit every young person in the country. The unemployed have surely no greater obligation to fight the nation's wars than other groups; a democratic defense system must call equally upon all citizens for service.

A movement for universal or selective training is growing, and its early sponsors, unfortunately though quite naturally, are mostly to be found among the conservative groups. But I shall be much surprised if the Administration does not soon come out for it, and I am certain that the issue will crop up during the Presidential campaign. I only hope progressives will rally to the support of universal training in time to make their influence felt. That such a system is compatible with democracy has been proved in other countries, notably in Switzerland. That it can be an effective tool of tyranny was proved in Germany long before Hitler. It serves, in fact, as an accurate gauge of the democratic strength of the nation that adopts it. It will be up to American progressives to see to it that we build a citizens' army designed to contribute to a secure and free national life.

Patriotism Plus

COMMENTING recently on the British decision to tax excess war profits 100 per cent, Carlton Shiveley of the New York *Sun* wrote:

> It will nevertheless be difficult for many Americans to understand how Britain can expect anyone to make the tremendous extra productive effort required by war without some stimulus other than the vague one that it is necessary to save the country. The first thing that capital will require to work harder in war time is some assurance of a larger return.

If a statement such as this had appeared in the pages of *The Nation* we would certainly have been accused of unjustly impugning the patriotism of a worthy class of persons. But Mr. Shiveley is so ardent a champion of business that one can hardly suspect him of wilful libel. Moreover, other publicists devoted to the welfare of capital have also been harping on the theme of the price which must be paid to the manufacturers of armaments if their cooperation is to be obtained for the defense program. Thus the *Wall Street Journal* of May 20 states

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in return for a rapid expansion in production "undoubtedly industry will demand many concessions in the way of tax exemptions, amortization policies, relaxation of labor laws, et cetera."

How far, at this time of crisis, the Administration and Congress are prepared to go in providing practical "stimulants" for business is not certain. The House Naval Affairs Committee, acting on a request by the Navy Department, has approved a bill which would make possible the replacement of competitive bidding for naval contracts by direct negotiations. It also provides for advance payments of 30 per cent of the contract price on naval business—that is to say, the government would contribute working capital to shipbuilders—and authorizes payment for special additional equipment and plant. Further, while the limit of a 10 per cent profit (12 per cent in the case of aircraft) prescribed by the Vinson-Trammell Act is retained, the proposed bill would allow contractors to deduct net profits of less than 10 per cent as well as net losses in computing profits in the next four years with a view to determining whether an excess has been earned. This is an important safeguard for a contractor who, by some accident, pitches his terms too low.

Similar protection seems likely to be extended to aircraft manufacturers, who are also looking for a change in Treasury policy which would enable them to write off the cost of expanding their facilities in a few years. The effect of this concession would be greatly to reduce their tax liability. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, agreement on this point would make the raising of additional capital "a relatively simple matter, since the companies could be sure of all the government business they could handle and would be allowed a 12 per cent profit under the Vinson-Trammell Act. In effect they would be operating under a cost-plus system, and if a guaranty could be obtained for a write-off of expansion costs, it is believed that bank loans would be easily obtainable."

They would, indeed, for any banker would be happy to finance at low interest the carrying out of such a gilt-edged contract, and there would be no need for any company to dilute the equity of its present shareholders by seeking new capital in the open market. On the other hand, it is difficult to see, if defense contracts are to be placed on such a safe basis for the manufacturers, why their patriotism should have to be sweetened to the extent of 12 per cent. After all, the theory of private enterprise looks on profit as a reward for taking risks.

We are not so optimistic as to believe that the new defense program can be carried out at high speed without a toll being paid to the shipbuilders, the aircraft companies, the steel mills, and the numerous other industries which control the capital equipment needed to manufacture armaments. For a shift to public ownership, however desirable in principle, would doubtless cause so much controversy and afford such opportunities for sabotage by the interests affected that it would result in delays intolerable at the present crisis. But we hope Congress is not going to give business *carte blanche* in the belief that it is the only way to get results. That was the British method under Chamberlain, and the results are to be seen in Flanders. Now Britain has had to turn to a war-time dictatorship over capital and labor alike, and output is soaring even if the stimulus of excess profits has been removed. "I think it is true to say," said Ernest Bevin, the new British Minister of Labor, "that the feeling of the people of this country is . . . that the system based on monopoly and big business has failed to deliver the goods in our hour of trial." Those words, and the experience which provoked them, are a warning which even business ought not to ignore.

Labor's Front Line

BUSINESSES working for the national defense are to be guaranteed their 12 per cent, but this is said to be no time for labor to try and "grab off 10 cents an hour" more in wages. The words are those of Representative Barden of North Carolina, commenting on the quickly settled C. I. O. shipyard strike at Kearny, New Jersey. The mood they reflect is being exploited to the utmost, and labor is in for a hard fight if it is to preserve even a part of the gains won under the New Deal. The amazing form in which the La Follette Oppressive Practices Act passed the Senate is only the most striking manifestation of the extent to which defense needs are being used to reduce labor standards and weaken the protection of workers. Labor's front line is on the Potomac.

It was the Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall, who launched the drive on May 18. General Marshall complained to a Senate subcommittee on military affairs that the Walsh-Healey Act and similar legislation, combined with what he described as the high pay of officers and men, made it necessary for the United States to spend $21 for every $1 spent by a European nation to maintain an equal force of men. Congressional leaders were only dissuaded from offering a bill to suspend the Walsh-Healey Act by a plea from the White House that the President already had power to do so. Under Section 6 of the act the Secretary of Labor may make exceptions from the established wage and hour standards "when justice or public interest will be served thereby." We predict increasing pressure to use this loophole.

At a press conference on May 21 Mr. Roosevelt said that not a single war millionaire would be created. He also expressed his confidence that "labor will not attempt to take advantage of its collective power to foment strikes and interfere with the national-defense program

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to squeeze higher wages from employers in the so-called war industries." But while profit restrictions are being lifted, wage protection is being weakened. "An effort is being made," the *Wall Street Journal* reported on June 10, "to prevent labor from 'profiteering' in the defense industries, thus avoiding any likelihood of large-scale migrations from one industry to another."

The President has also said that he would not sanction the weakening of social legislation in the emergency, but it will take stout resistance to pressure to carry out the pledge. Laws need not be repealed to be negatived, and the *Journal of Commerce* on June 8 indicated one way in which labor standards might be modified. "Although the Administration opposes the relaxation of labor legislation to facilitate national defense," that newspaper reported, "the Wages and Hours Division of the Department of Labor is studying plans for meeting situations likely to arise in the defense industries." New industry committees may be appointed for the armament industries "to adapt wage and hour regulations to their special needs," and "in an industry which afforded extensive overtime, the wage minimum might be made lower than would otherwise be the case." Thus, unless labor is careful, the wage-and-hour law may be used to *lower* wages and *increase* hours.

Two main lines of attack on labor standards are visible. The first is indicated in an increasing volume of newspaper editorial comment to the effect that we must not make "the same mistake as France." "A moral is drawn," by the New York *Times*, "from the French Popular Front government, under which labor laws and restrictions on profits interfered with the nation's armament program." This suave version of "guns, not butter" has also been taken up by the Scripps-Howard press. The other line of attack utilizes fear of the fifth column. Thus the Merchants' Association of New York attacked the La Follette bill on May 25 as follows: "The fact that the bill specifies that a company's armed guard cannot lawfully operate outside of the company's property . . . is a practical invitation to subversive elements . . . to hamstring the employer for alleged 'oppressive labor practices' and to effect these fifth-column practices under the protection of the proposed law." But the treacheries that left the British and French so poorly prepared to meet the Nazi onslaught occurred at the top, not at the bottom, of their society, and if democracy is to make an effective stand in this country it will not be by attempting to appease the reactionary elements of business and finance. The difference between the worker's pay envelope under dictatorship and under democracy is one measure of freedom's value to the worker in self-respect and decent living. Let us keep the difference wide.

Where Trade Means Safety

BY CHARLES E. NOYES

DEFENSE of the Western Hemisphere has suddenly assumed vital importance to millions of people in the United States who never before devoted any serious thought to Latin America. The Monroe Doctrine has been transformed almost overnight from a principle of comparative isolationism to a statement of purpose essential for the safety of this country. The real danger of a hostile air base in South America gives it a wholly new significance. At the same moment it has become clear that the United States is not physically prepared to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. Even granting that battleships are still useful in modern total war, the American fleet is not strong enough to defend both the Atlantic and the Pacific coast of North America; it cannot be used to protect South America against a serious military threat from victorious totalitarian powers as long as our relations with Japan require its presence in the Pacific.

Our first reaction to this revealed weakness has been a demand for vastly increased armaments, and we shall undoubtedly get them. But ships, guns, and planes are not in themselves enough. We must also prepare ourselves mentally to live in a world which may be completely different from the one we have known. We must realize, to begin with, that to make our defense of the Western Hemisphere, or even of our own country, effective, we must work in close cooperation with twenty other American republics. This will be a novel idea to the citizen accustomed to thinking of the United States as a benevolent protector of the vaguely imagined lands to the south, but its acceptance is essential to an intelligent defense program. We are vulnerable if any part of the two Americas is vulnerable.

Fortunately, President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have done more to promote pan-American good-will than all their predecessors for a hundred years; unfortunately, they have only begun to erase the justified suspicion with which the Latin American countries look toward the United States. And their efforts have had very little genuine popular support in this country. Perhaps the present danger will help the American public to understand that it is not in our interest to treat the other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries of this hemisphere like wayward step-children. If it does not bring about this understanding, our expenditures for ships and armament may be largely in vain.

Before the present European war Germany had been making phenomenal progress in developing trade with South America, and the Nazis were conducting a campaign of ideological penetration with considerable success. It is obvious that a victorious Germany would attempt to resume both processes immediately and on a larger scale. And it is equally obvious that the United States should make every possible effort now to forestall any such penetration. Aside from our national ignorance about the rest of the hemisphere, the chief trouble is that the United States does not provide a natural market for the bulk of Latin American trade, though we could profitably supply most of the things Latin America wants to buy if it could find the means to pay for them. We buy Brazilian coffee, some Bolivian tin, and some Chilean nitrates, among other things, but we do not want South American wheat, corn, or beef. In what we used to consider normal times, the United States was both the largest importer from and the largest exporter to Latin America, but we accounted for only about one-third of the total trade. In 1938 Germany bought more than 10 per cent of Latin American exports and sold more than 17 per cent of Latin American imports. In South America alone, the United States' share was smaller and the German share larger. Germany bought $41,000,000 worth of exports from Argentina, as compared with $29,000,000 worth bought by the United States.

The Western Hemisphere could be an economic unit in the sense that it can produce everything which is necessary for contemporary industrial civilization. It is not at present an economic unit in the sense of being able to carry on a satisfactory volume of trade wholly within itself. But this second type of economic unity is necessary to independence in a world which is threatened with domination by totalitarian powers. No country which becomes economically dependent upon a totalitarian nation can retain genuine political independence. Trade has become an integral part of international power politics.

Even the United States has serious weaknesses in its sources of supply. It used to be maintained, for example, that we were not vitally concerned with the ownership of the Dutch East Indies, since any owner, no matter who it was, would want to profit from the United States' market for rubber. That might be true in peace time, but the United States would be distressingly vulnerable if a hostile power were in a position suddenly to cut off virtually its entire rubber supply. Even in peace time, control of our sources of rubber by a totalitarian power would make us susceptible to the various forms of commercial blackmail which have been widely practiced during the past ten years.

We may be strong enough to resist such blackmail, perhaps by the threat of cutting off our trade with any power which tried to hold us up. The Latin American countries are not strong enough to resist. They must export wherever they can find a market, or suffer a drastic reduction in their already low standards of living. And if the countries which take a substantial part of their exports demand the right to sell them a large proportion of the manufactured goods which they buy, if totalitarian powers demand also the right to send propaganda agents and to receive friendly treatment in their newspapers, it is very hard for any Latin American government to oppose such demands. Interference with trade and lower standards of living are not popular even if their long-range purpose is national defense—unless, of course, they are imposed by governments which have themselves become totalitarian enough to use Nazi methods of influencing public opinion.

No Latin American government is as democratic as the more idealistic American liberals would like it to be; but neither is any one of them as yet fully totalitarian after the Italian and German models. At the present moment it behooves the United States rather to preserve such elements of democracy as do exist in the rest of the hemisphere than to scold our neighbors for not being more like us. There is no government in Latin America today which would prefer friendly relations with Germany to friendly relations with us, though they are not all as deeply antagonistic to the Nazis as we are. If they do become fully totalitarian, they will look to Europe rather than to us for support.

We have wasted eight months of golden opportunity. Last September the United States was flooded with glowing predictions that we might permanently capture a much larger segment of Latin American trade, although the more cautious experts pointed out the inherent difficulties resulting from the fact that a large proportion of Latin American exports are in direct competition with things which we ourselves produce, in some cases with foodstuffs and fibers of which we have an embarrassing exportable surplus. The experts were right: the expansion of our Latin American trade has been disappointing. And with the present disposition of American producers to demand full tariff protection for every single product which is grown, mined, or manufactured in this country, there is simply no chance that we can hold Latin American trade against European competition when the war is over. We are therefore faced with this question: If Germany wins the war, will it not be necessary for us as part of our own military defense, to make substantial commercial sacrifices in order to prevent the growth of German commercial and ideological influence in Latin America? And hadn't we better do something about it now, while we have the advantage? If Germany wins, there is no possible doubt that the Nazis will move much faster and more efficiently than the United States. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot even make a real start until we have educated American public opinion, particularly in the cattle, grain-raising, and silver-producing states, to understand that national defense is more important than our traditional system of tariff protection.

Of course, it would not be fair, or reasonable, or politically possible suddenly to lower the tariff on certain items which we might import from Latin America and to ask the producers of those goods in the United States to absorb the losses. We have had ample evidence during the last ten years that any sudden disruption of one or two segments of our economy is likely to have disastrous repercussions on the whole structure. The problem is nevertheless not incapable of solution. As a matter of fact, the combined exports of all the twenty other American republics in 1938 were valued at only $1,758,014,000, of which we bought $357,215,000 worth. If we bought all the rest and dumped it into the ocean, it would cost us only about $1,401,000,000, less than half of what we expect to spend on armaments this year, and it would probably be worth while from a strictly defense point of view. Fortunately, no such drastic step is necessary. Much of the first sum represents internal trading between the Latin American countries: the combined value of their exports to England, Germany, Japan, France, and Italy, their other five best customers, was only $581,388,000. Exports to Germany amounted to only $181,000,000.

If we had to take all the exports formerly going to Europe and Japan, they would not need to be a total loss. We might, for example, distribute the foodstuffs under some form of expanded food-stamp plan to needy families in the United States. We might reexport many of the products ourselves, absorbing a loss if necessary. Or we might pay the present tariff rates out of the United States Treasury, so as not to depress American prices. These are not meant to be more than suggestions, and each of them admittedly involves real difficulties. Perhaps a more painless plan can be devised. The main thing is to do something while we still have the chance. And on the bright side of the picture, any increase in our imports from Latin America should lead to a corresponding increase in our exports.

It is not even necessary to divert all Latin American exports away from the totalitarian countries. What we must do is to make sure that no country in Latin America becomes so dependent for prosperity on exports elsewhere that it will be unable to resist totalitarian commercial and ideological penetration. Every one of the American republics is anxious to resist. We can make it possible for them to do so at comparatively small expense to ourselves—perhaps without any expense, if we are clever and realistic enough. But we must understand that our Latin American trade cannot safely be left to the chance workings of conventional economics. The trade-agreements program, in practice, does not go nearly far enough. It is simply ridiculous for us to say, in the present state of the world, that we must allow trade to follow its natural course. In most of the world the natural course of trade no longer exists.

We do not have to adopt totalitarian methods of complete import, export, and exchange control in order to compete with the totalitarian countries. To do so would be to admit that their system is more efficient than ours. Actually, their methods have not worked any too well as a purely commercial policy. But neither have our own. And it is time for us to admit that our traditional tariff and trade policies, in so far as they may force our neighbors to trade with our potential enemies, are luxuries which we can no longer afford.

We have been pursuing a policy of economic nationalism while we were committed, under the Monroe Doctrine, to hemisphere defense. The two things can no longer be reconciled. Only because hemisphere defense was supported by the British navy were they ever able to exist side by side. As soon as we are threatened with removal of that support, it becomes apparent that our economic policy must be changed. We cannot defend the hemisphere without making such a change, and without defending the hemisphere we cannot defend ourselves.

As a first step we should immediately remove exasperating economic irritants in our relations with various Latin American countries. We should take advantage of Mexico's settlement of its controversy with the Sinclair oil interests to resolve the whole problem created by Mexican expropriation of American properties. We should cease to embargo Argentine beef on the insulting pretense that all Argentine cattle are diseased, and should ratify the sanitary agreement with Argentina which has been pending in the United States Senate for five years. We should immediately reopen negotiations for trade agreements with all Latin American countries which have not yet concluded such agreements with us. We might liberalize the policies of the Export-Import Bank and subscribe to the shares allotted to the United States in the proposed Inter-American Bank. These initial moves would afford a practical opportunity to educate the American public with respect to the importance of Latin America. When we are prepared to approach the various problems realistically, there should be a pan-American economic conference.

We must also develop plans for military cooperation throughout the Western Hemisphere. But unless we are willing to undertake a sound pan-American economic program, any preparation to defend more than the narrow limits of continental United States is likely to be a waste of money. The price of real military cooperation will be commercial concessions sufficient to make our military defense seem desirable to our neighbors. Our willingness to pay that price is a fundamental test of our understanding of what defense has come to mean.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Men Who Would Be President

VIII. HULL CAN WAIT

BY BARNET NOVER

CORDELL HULL has steadily denied that he is a candidate for the Democratic nomination. And there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his disclaimers. If the Presidential bee has ever stung him he exhibits none of the customary swellings. He has never spoken or acted like a would-be candidate. He has never made any open or covert bid for delegates, even on a when, as, and if basis. On the contrary, he has persistently discouraged admirers who have sought to line up delegates for him. I doubt very much whether he would give it a second thought if the Chicago convention passed him by. Yet it would be fantastic to assume that if his nomination became a possibility he would be unreceptive to the honor.

American history offers only one example of a man who, after being mentioned prominently for the Presidency, flatly said: "I will not run if nominated; I will not serve if elected." But Sherman was a soldier, with a soldier's impatience with politics. To Hull politics have been food and drink, vocation and avocation, for half a century. To have been Secretary of State for eight years is honor enough for any man, and both Hull and Mrs. Hull have frequently voiced to friends their eagerness, when the present Administration ends, to drop the cares of official life and seek the quiet of their Tennessee farm. But duty is the twin brother of ambition and its effective substitute; and if Hull lacks ambition he has a highly developed sense of duty.

Despite his very real handicaps Hull's chances of getting the Democratic nomination compare favorably with those of the men who have been openly campaigning for it. His chief handicap is his age. If he should be elected, Hull would be a year older at the time of his inauguration than was William Henry Harrison, the oldest of American Presidents, who survived his inauguration by just one month. He would be seventeen years older than the average age at which our last ten Chief Executives took office. Hull has a tough and wiry physique, has lived simply and carefully, and comes of a long-lived stock, but the Presidency is an office which has worn out far younger men.

A second obstacle is presented by geography. The United States has not had a President from south of the Mason and Dixon Line since the Civil War. And Tennessee is not a crucial state. Nevertheless, a combination of circumstances has thrust the Secretary of State into an especially favorable position, and a recent Gallup poll shows that his stock is rising with the people. With the exception of the President, he is the only outstanding Democrat whom the people recognize as experienced in the conduct of foreign affairs, and today America's international problems overshadow domestic issues. He has consistently opposed the isolationist point of view, and events have proved the tragic correctness of his contention that the United States cannot safely ignore or discount the impact of events in Europe. Because of the nation's preoccupation with external problems it is an asset rather than a handicap for Hull that throughout his tenure in the Cabinet he has maintained an unbroken silence on all questions not directly connected with the functions of his department. He took no public position for or against the devaluation of the dollar, the NRA, the AAA, the court-packing plan, and other great controversial issues. He has never given the slightest indication where he stands on the Wage-Hour Act, the Labor Board, relief, budget-balancing, pump-priming, the Walter-Logan bill.

This aloofness on his part has been perfectly natural; politics have, or should have, no place in foreign relations. And it has had a curiously favorable result on his prospects of obtaining the nomination. Because he belongs through age and past associations with an older and more orthodox generation of Democrats, critics of the New Deal regard his possible candidacy with favor. At the same time the New Dealers are unable to point to a single statement he has made or action he has taken which justifies any charge that he is or has been hostile to the New Deal. Thus up to the time of Hitler's assault on Belgium and the Netherlands and the consequent increased likelihood of a third term for the President, Hull was coming more and more into view as an almost ideal compromise candidate to head the Democratic ticket.

If he were a man less lacking in guile, the policy he has pursued might be regarded as one deliberately designed to achieve a maximum political effect with a minimum of political risk. Actually the reason why Hull has conducted himself as he has in relation both to the New Deal and to the Democratic nomination has nothing to do with calculation and a good deal to do with the kind of man he is. All his life he has been a specialist, with a specialist's timidity in stepping out of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his field, and as Secretary of State he has had particularly strong motives for not breaking the habits of a lifetime. To an astonishing degree his career has been all of a piece. Over a period of fifty years his interests have been limited to the Democratic Party, tariff reform—with which at the outset he coupled advocacy of the income tax—and international cooperation.

Almost the first thing he did as a freshman member of Congress from Tennessee in 1907 was to introduce bills for the repeal of duties on agricultural implements, coal, and certain other articles and for levying an income tax. He was a specialist before he had cut his Congressional teeth, and he remained a specialist throughout his long service in the House and his later career as United States Senator. His guide and mentor had been Benton McMillin, for twenty years a Congressman from Tennessee and an indefatigable advocate of lower tariffs and an income tax. It was both a statement of his credo and a tribute to his teacher when, in his first important speech in Congress, Hull denounced the protective tariff and the Republican Party for having foisted the protective tariff on the nation. He went on to expound his underlying philosophy. "The Democratic Party," he said, "is conservative whenever conservatism will suffice. It is radical whenever radicalism is necessary to uproot deep-seated evils that afflict the country. It makes no war on wealth. While it declares eternal war on wealthy violators of the law, it guarantees to all law-abiding aggregations of wealth freedom from molestation. No party can be conservative on all policies at all times."

Hull has never ceased ringing the changes on these related themes. In the debate of March 29, 1909, for instance, he denounced "the spirit of greed and avarice" which, he said, permeated every schedule of the Payne-Aldrich tariff. In the session of June 9, 1911, in opening the debate on the wool schedule, he called the protective tariff "the king of all our evils," spoke of the "sleepless monster of protection," and declared that the underlying cause of existing economic, financial, and social ills was "this partnership of the government with crime—the protective tariff." At the same time he kept hammering away at the need of an income tax, and when, with the ratification of the Sixteenth Amendment, income-tax legislation became constitutional, Hull fathered the basic law. After the World War he denounced the Fordney-McCumber and Smoot-Hawley experiments in protectionism with his customary vigor. In these debates he has always revealed his thoroughgoing knowledge of the subject, but he is no orator. Witty, flavorsome, picturesque in private conversation, he tends to be deadly earnest and heavy in his public pronouncements.

By birth, upbringing, and demeanor Hull belongs in the log-cabin tradition. He was actually born in a cabin, in what is now Pickett County, Tennessee, and spent his early youth near the Obey River, where his father, William Hull, was engaged in logging. Young Hull became famous for two accomplishments—his skill in debating and his ability to pilot log rafts down the river. The latter required not merely physical strength but also endless patience. That patience has remained with him.

He attended Mount Vale Academy at Selina and received his higher education at Cumberland University in Lebanon, from which he was graduated with a law degree in 1891. By that time he was already knee-deep in politics. It is related of him that at the age of sixteen he used his pocket money to hire a conveyance in which he drove the governor of the state on a campaign tour of his district. At nineteen he took part in the state Democratic convention. He had been out of school only a little more than a year when he was elected to the state Legislature. On the outbreak of the Spanish-American War he organized a company which reached Cuba too late for the fighting. He returned to practice law, but in 1903 he was appointed to the circuit court of his state. After riding circuit for four years he was elected to Congress. To his old friends he is still Judge Hull, a title he relishes above all others.

The region where Hull was born and where he spent the years of his early manhood continues to this day to have something of the flavor of the frontier. The mark it left on him has not been erased by years of Washington living and high office. He remains today as he was when he arrived in the capital thirty-three years ago—a shy, unassuming, homespun individual. The quiet dignity of his manner is a native, not an acquired characteristic. There is more than a fancied resemblance between Hull and Lincoln, as Hull's admirers have repeatedly emphasized. Lincoln's humility, patience, and pessimism have their counterpart in Hull. Like Lincoln, Hull has never lost the common touch.

Hull's simplicity of character was manifested to best advantage, perhaps, at the Montevideo conference, the Roosevelt Administration's first venture in pan-Americanism. The story has often been told of his arriving at the Uruguayan capital as representative of the most powerful nation on the hemisphere and going at once, hat in hand, to make a personal call on the heads of the other delegations. It was a neighborly gesture which disarmed the Latin American statesmen, who were prepared at Montevideo, as at previous pan-American conferences, to show their hostility to the United States.

Hull's patience was demonstrated when in the middle of the international economic conference at London in 1933 President Roosevelt decided to change his policy and left his Secretary of State high and dry. Hull returned to the United States fighting mad, giving vent among intimates to that picturesque vocabulary of vituperation which he reserves for private use and which contrasts markedly with the language of his formal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speeches. But he is a man who knows how to wait. He outwaited Moley. He outwaited George Peek, another victim of his terrible tenacity. He outwaited the skeptics who regarded him as a misfit in a New Deal Administration. In the end it was not the economic nationalism of Moley and the other early New Dealers but the economic internationalism of Hull, the stone rejected by the builders in 1933, which became the basis of the Administration's foreign policy.

The fate of the trade-agreements program which Hull fathered is now very much in doubt. Everything depends on what happens in Europe. If Hitler wins the war, the international economic system we have known will probably disappear completely, and with it Hull's painstaking efforts to remove the barriers of trade. If Hitler is finally smashed, the Hull program, capable as it is of indefinite expansion, may help to heal the wounds of war and restore trade to a normal basis. Unfortunately the program came too late, progressed too slowly, to remove the economic evils which Hull is convinced lie at the basis of international strife. For this, however, Hull is not to blame. Two years before Woodrow Wilson announced his Fourteen Points, one of which called for the removal of artificial barriers to trade, Hull suggested that after the war an international trade conference be held in Washington for the "purpose of establishing a permanent international trade-agreement congress, the functions of which should comprise the consideration of all international trade methods, practices, and policies of an unfair, unequal, and objectionable nature." He returned to that idea several times in later years, but it was not until 1934 that he brought it to even partial fruition in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As a shrewd politician Hull had realized that he had to move slowly and carefully and provide no valid pretext to members of Congress to charge him with having sacrificed national interest.

The trade-agreements program could only have succeeded in laying the foundation of peace if it had been coupled with a far-reaching American program of action in international politics. Such a program, had it been feasible, Hull would unquestionably have supported. His attitude on foreign affairs has always been Wilsonian. In 1923, while holding the thankless job of chairman of the Democratic National Committee, he gave an interview to *Collier's Weekly* in which he declared that the Democrats would make the League an issue in the campaign of 1924. As Secretary of State he has given as much aid and encouragement to the League as was possible while the country remained virulently isolationist. No one saw the dangers of this state of mind better than Hull and Roosevelt, but the Administration's foreign policy was compelled to be, as Alsop and Kintner have aptly described it, an *Ersatz* policy. It could not be effective without action, and the American people were not ready for action. Therefore it had to take the form of educating the American people to the realities of the world situation, and while this process was going on, trying to stave off Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese with warnings, entreaties, expostulations, homilies, and cautious half-measures.

Under our system the President tends to be his own Secretary of State. With a Chief Executive as dynamic as Franklin D. Roosevelt this would seem to be particularly the case. Actually Hull has been no figurehead in the Administration. His influence on American foreign policy in this critical period has been very real. Roosevelt's boldness has been tempered by Hull's caution; Roosevelt's improvisations have been modified by Hull's common sense. Hull shares the responsibility with the White House for letting the neutrality legislation get out of hand, for submitting to what was thought to be an overwhelming popular desire rather than fighting it tooth and nail. He also shares the responsibility for the ineptitude of the Spanish policy, the rigid legislative basis of which was laid while Hull was at Buenos Aires attending the Inter-American Conference. His note to Senator Pittman opposing any action on the arms embargo by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee makes strange reading today.

Secretary of State Hull

But with these exceptions it can be said of Hull that long before public opinion became aware of the realities he saw the international picture clearly and did everything he could to stave off the catastrophe which now engulfs the world. "I have never been within a thousand miles of Munich," he once told a visitor. Peace can result only from a positive policy—this Hull has always understood. That is why he has placed such emphasis on his trade-agreements program, on efforts to build an inter-American system of cooperation.

But the people and Congress chose to make avoidance of war the be-all and the end-all of our relations with the world. And as a result we find ourselves today more threatened, more frightened, and less secure than at any other time in over a century. No wonder that Hull's native pessimism has taken a deeper hue. But he works and waits. He may outwait Hitler. Cordell Hull does not give up easily.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case for Bertrand Russell

BY JOHN DEWEY

THE defense of Bertrand Russell in connection with his appointment to the chair of philosophy in the City College of New York has quite properly centered about two points. One of them is the legal authority of a court to overrule and nullify the action of an administrative board created according to the statutes of New York State. The other is whether writings upon matters of great social importance addressed to adults shall be used to deprive the author of the power to teach his own special and very different subject in classrooms of higher institutions of learning. If courts have the power claimed for them, appointments in tax-supported institutions—and possibly in private institutions—will be thrown into a state of uncertainty till they have dragged through the courts, while educational administrative bodies are deprived of responsibility as well as of power. If Justice McGeehan's action is upheld with respect to the second point, the effect will be to muzzle university teachers on subjects not directly connected with their specialties of instruction.

There is another issue which should not be lost sight of. The profuse outgivings of the attorney for the complainant and of the justice who passed on the case have surrounded what Mr. Russell actually wrote with such a disgusting and loathsome aura that many otherwise fair-minded people have been misled as to what he said. The public interest in discussion of such matters of sexual morals as the use of contraceptives, the stability of family life, the sex education, direct and indirect, of children, the population problem, eugenics, and the like, even more than fair play to Mr. Russell—which has been conspicuously lacking in the treatment given him—raises the questions: What has Mr. Russell actually said and in what spirit has he said it? Neither of these questions can be even approached, much less settled, on the basis of passages torn out of their context.

In the first place, it is necessary to mention a few facts about moral theory which are elementary to all modern students not committed in advance to some scheme of supernatural and theological ethics. One fact recognized by such students is that the bases and sanctions of morals are found in human relations and their bearing upon human welfare. Another is that cultural lag is nowhere more evident than in the discrepancy existing between the conclusions of specialists in anthropology, medicine, psychology, and so on upon general matters of ethical theory—not just special matters of sexual ethics—and popular beliefs, which, when they have not been received from some dogmatic institutional source, have usually been picked up from the flotsam and jetsam of old traditions. Because of this discrepancy any public discussion based upon results reached by scientific investigators but couched in words that can be understood by those without specialized technical training is bound to be disturbing, and even shocking. This fact, especially weighty in connection with all matters of sexual morality, where in any case the discrepancy between actual social practices and traditional opinions is greatest, is easily taken advantage of by those who believe in the theological bases for the morality that is taught and sanctioned by ecclesiastical "authorities." Unless this fact is borne in mind, it is impossible to understand either the animus of the attack upon Mr. Russell or the effect produced by quotations from his writings upon the minds of those who do not share that animus.

Mr. Russell's discussion, in his writings, of the need for a new sexual ethic has been too successfully represented as if it were a repudiation of any sexual ethic whatever. His argument, based upon facts derived from a variety of sources, that the current sexual ethics, more honored in words than in fact, contain many elements of superstitious origin, while the social practices based upon them have lost their efficacy because of political and economic changes, is completely passed over. Emotional panic is aroused in the breasts of many good people by the mere suggestion that the old sexual ethics have broken down. The treatment that has been accorded Mr. Russell is then more significant as evidence of the gap that lies between the attitude of scientific students and the tenor of prevalent opinions than it is of anything else. And the basic issue is not whether Mr. Russell's own views are correct but whether efforts to bridge the existing gap shall be prevented or at least discouraged by abuse of anyone who engages in public discussion not couched in highly technical language.

The spirit in which Mr. Russell approached the topics discussed is important. To a student of social psychology there is nothing surprising in the fact that an audience which feeds willingly on flippant and easygoing discussion of sex in the novels it reads should be shocked by a serious discussion of sex. For Mr. Russell's discussion is serious in spite of an occasional regrettable asperity of tone. The following passages could be multiplied many times over: "I don't think that the new system any more than the old should involve an unbridled yielding to license, but I think the occasions for restraining

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impulse and the motives for doing so will have to be different from what they have been in the past"; and again, "The doctrine I wish to preach is not one of license; it involves exactly as much self-control as is involved in the conventional doctrine." For, as he says, "Sex cannot dispense with an ethic, any more than business or sport or scientific research or any other branch of human activity." He accepts the idea now generally held by competent students that impulses are to be trained rather than suppressed. He holds that very many of the evils which he in common with other moralists deplores are due to the existence of conditions which give misdirection to impulse and desire. Consequently there is something ironical in the attacks upon him which proceed from persons who hold that all natural tendencies are so inherently bad and all sexual impulses so intrinsically indecent that not only they but any reference to them should be suppressed.

Regarding the principles which are used in providing the criteria for a sound sexual ethics, Russell writes:

> Sex morality has to be derived from certain general principles, as to which there is perhaps a fairly wide measure of agreement, in spite of the wide disagreement as to the consequences to be drawn from them. The first thing to be secured is that there should be as much as possible of that deep, serious love between man and woman which embraces the whole personality of both and leads to a fusion by which each is enriched and enhanced. The second thing of importance is that there should be adequate care of children, physical and psychological.

As Mr. Russell indicates, not all who accept these principles and who attempt to draw consequences from them in the light of the best knowledge available will agree with all the conclusions upon special points which he reaches. It happens that personally I agree with some of his conclusions and disagree with others; and to me it appears that in the cases in which I disagree Mr. Russell adopts a logic more appropriate to mathematical than to social and moral subjects—a logic, that is, of one-way reasoning from a single set of premises. But any such difference in conclusions is not only no reason for penalizing one who discusses in a serious spirit the issues involved but is a possible reason for having the issues publicly discussed, so that light may be gained from a variety of sources. The only thing ruled out is the dogmatism and intolerance that would forbid discussion.

In any case the persons, if there be such, who go to Mr. Russell's writings in search of filth and obscenity will be disappointed. These things are so lacking that the intemperate and morally irresponsible way in which they are charged against Mr. Russell is good reason for believing that those who put them forth hold such an "authoritarian" view of morals that they would, if they had power, suppress all critical discussion of beliefs and practices they want to impose on others.

In the Wind

IF THE UNITED STATES gets into the war, Lowell Mellett, former editor of the Scripps-Howard Washington *News*, will run the government's "publicity" department—modern equivalent of the Creel committee. Mellett left the Scripps-Howard chain after the reorganization-bill fight, when he clashed sharply with the Howard policy.

THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANY of America has traditionally used as a trademark a picture of the Rock of Gibraltar with the motto, "The Prudential has the Strength of Gibraltar." Now that the threat of *Blitzkrieg* and Stukas has robbed the Rock of its symbolic meaning, it is rumored that the Prudential is contemplating a revised slogan.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN'S New York *Sunday Inquirer*—as passionately isolationist as it is anti-Communist—has worked out a new line. It contends that Communists really want the United States to go to war—so that they can make the revolution—and that the C. P. is advocating isolation because it knows the party is unpopular and wants to discredit isolationism.

THE *PM* STORY to end all *PM* stories: Ken Stewart, now of *PM*, formerly of the New York *Times*, went to a party shortly before leaving the *Times*. His host introduced him to guests as "Mr. Stewart of the *Times*." One of the guests said, "Oh, you mean that new paper that's coming out in New York?"

REPORTERS WEREN'T admitted to the recent meeting of the C. I. O. Executive Committee, but insiders say that the session started turbulently, ended placidly. At the outset Lewis clashed sharply with Sidney Hillman's representative, but peace gradually returned. C. I. O. leaders previously accused of "Stalinism" did nothing to challenge the committee's indorsement of the armament program. Lewis, for his part, turned thumbs down on a resolution denouncing aggressor nations. He is said to be still predominantly isolationist.

AT A RECENT meeting of the New York Society of the Pure-Minded, Bishop Manning spoke on The Need for Morals in Mathematics. The meeting was held at the Church of the Holy Innocents.

M. SARACOGLU, Turkish Minister of Foreign Affairs, received a Nazi journalist at Ankara recently. The Nazi expounded Germany's *Lebensraum* thesis, concluding, "The Balkans are Germany's lungs." "Indeed," retorted the Foreign Minister, "but why does your country have to breathe through other people's lungs?"

[We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Issues and Men

BY OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THE news from South America is anything but encouraging. I have just seen a letter from Edward Tomlinson, the writer and lecturer, written from Chile, in which he declares that, from the United States' point of view, the situation has grown markedly worse since his last visit some months ago—he has been traveling in South America annually for the last sixteen years. The effect there of Hitler's successes is quite evident, he reports, and he fears that when he reaches the east coast he will find things worse. Of course it is characteristic of a type of human nature to be found everywhere that it bows down before success. Plenty of persons even in the United States are beginning to admire Hitler because he appears now to be winning. What makes admiration for Hitler the easier in South America is that there are so few real republics there—the man on horseback is usually in control.

All in all, the South American situation is so complex that if the American government had nothing else to worry about than this, it would have its hands full. The more I study it and think about it the more difficult, yes, the more insoluble, it appears, despite the outward signs of unanimity, as in the matter of keeping this war away from American waters. With all respect for the desire of this country to safeguard itself, the nations to the south of us are bound to be made uneasy by our tremendous armament program. This is not because we shall be better able to subjugate Central and South America to our will than we always have been potentially, but because the visible signs of our power cause unfavorable reactions. Moreover, such open manifestations of our uneasiness as the hasty dispatch of a cruiser to South America and General Marshall's forthright statement that the President's demand for supreme power over the National Guard is due to a possible emergency in South America cannot but bring the issue of how far the United States shall take over the defense of its sister republics even more squarely before them.

That the assumption of the entire military responsibility for South America would be an enormous task is obvious, even though Major George Fielding Eliot has said that it would not be much harder than defending ourselves. Perhaps that is true from the navy's point of view, but if we are to be prepared to throw expeditionary forces into Patagonia or Brazil or Chile or Bolivia, it will mean keeping a large army "in being," together with the necessary fleet of transports ready to leave at a day's notice. What assurance could any American Administration give that some subsequent President would not use the vast armaments of the United States to put down a revolutionary government which it thought too friendly to dictatorships abroad?

Let us suppose that Hitler wins and that the Argentine dictator makes a hard and fast alliance with Hitler and Mussolini, or that Brazil sets up a totalitarian state, partly because of the vast numbers of Germans in that country. What would be the attitude of the United States? Would it tell the Argentine government to cancel that treaty, and would it send our battleships to Buenos Aires to see that this was done? Would it inform Brazil that it would seize and hold Rio de Janeiro until a republican form of government was established? These are not impossible suppositions. One of our highest officials assured me more than a year ago that Hitler could provoke a Nazi revolution in two South American countries by merely pressing a button on his desk.

And what would we do? The good-neighbor policy has transformed our relations with South and Central America and given them a confidence in our honesty and unselfishness that they never had before. If we intervened to dictate a form of government to one country, would we not destroy all the results of that policy and turn all our American allies against us? This danger may be remote, but we should not become the military custodian of all the Americas without most careful consideration of what it may involve. If I am reminded that the Monroe Doctrine has always implied that, my answer is that implication is one thing and action another. We have never before planned such armaments and never witnessed such a development as the totalitarian governments of today or the total war of this hour.

Personally I wholly approve of the declaration just indorsed by Congress that we shall view with disapproval the transfer of any territory now held by a foreign power in our sphere to any other foreign power; and I am glad that we are to associate the twenty-one republics with us in this matter. I have no fear that this might involve us in hostilities. About the major problem, however, which is whether we shall become not merely the defender of Latin America but the custodian of its member countries, pledged perhaps to prevent the rise of any totalitarian government, I have doubts, scruples, and apprehension. Yet so great is the panic in Washington that I have no doubt most people there will say: "Our safety comes first—we'll see to that whether anybody likes it or not."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Planning for War

MOBILIZING CIVILIAN AMERICA. By Harold J. Tobin and Percy W. Bidwell. Council on Foreign Relations. New York. $2.75.

THE timeliness of this book is unquestioned. Whether it will have any effect on official or popular opinion is uncertain. Indeed, present indications are that the carefully laid schemes for mobilizing civilian effort, prepared over the years by the War Department's Planning Branch, are, for the time being at least, completely in the discard. They do not appeal to the President—the commander-in-chief of the army and navy. This is not surprising, for the plans were drawn up independently of him and with scant concern as to whether the blueprints were for an administrative edifice that he would like.

In the National Defense Act of 1920 Congress "undertook to establish efficient cooperation among the supply services of the army, and between them and the industrial plants. Acting under this authority, the Assistant Secretary of War set up the Planning Branch, the Army and Navy Munitions Planning Board, and the Army Industrial College." The resulting activity was great. But little attention was paid to the inherent undesirability of placing planning for the mobilization of civilian America under the direction of an assistant secretary in one of the service departments. Such an undertaking should have been under the President so that the imagination behind it would have been less military and naval and more civilian.

Naturally enough, perhaps, the War Department was reluctant to share its task with other departments of the government. It did consult them, and expert outsiders as well, but the resulting products were the War Department's own. They were made public several times, discussed and modified because some of the first proposals—for censorship and the control of labor—were affrighting. The Industrial Mobilization Plan of 1939—which is skeletonized and must be read in the light of previous drafts—proposes a number of special administrators of civilian activity not very dissimilar to the organization which finally evolved under President Wilson.

But President Roosevelt has other ideas. Apparently he wishes to rely as far as he can on existing agencies and have them perform the new tasks. Hence, in so far as his ideas seem to be clear, they go counter to the Planning Branch's proposals. But those proposals, as I have said, if excogitated under less particularistic auspices, might have made some compromise between the conflicting points of view. This would have been clearly desirable. Nothing is as wasteful and chaotic as the duplication of governmental machinery. On the other hand, as the failures of the much-vaunted administrative class of the British Civil Service have clearly demonstrated, men who have spent the formative years of their mature lives in the routine tasks of government bureaus cannot suddenly acquire the independence in thought, imagination in conception, and drive in execution which preparations for possible war demand of them in the fullest measure.

Under the sponsorship of the Council on Foreign Relations, Mr. Tobin had exceptional opportunities for finding out what the Planning Branch of the War Department had actually done. In preparing his book for the press he has had the collaboration of Mr. Bidwell, the Council's Director of Studies, who contributes an able discussion of economic problems relating to labor, priorities, prices, profits, and procurement planning. Here are to be found, at least in broad outline, indications of the problems that will have to be faced. So far, the debates in Washington fail to show that in high quarters there is adequate appreciation of the central issue: that successful preparation for defense must pay the price of a more totalitarian economy.

There are other important matters which are perhaps outside the scope of this volume, and they ought to be thought of before it is too late. British experience in the last war and in the halting preparations for the present conflict clearly shows that procurement—not only the process but the determination of what should be procured—cannot with safety be left to the soldiers and sailors. They are innately hostile to expenditures on new weapons either of offense or defense. "Each department and each section," Sir Arthur Salter has declared, "will obtain a financial provision, an allocation of resources and of personnel, which corresponds with its influence and prestige, that is, as a rule, with its record in the last war, and the newcomer will be given a grudging, gradually increasing, but always inadequate share. So it was feared; so it has proved."

President Roosevelt has recently expressed the view that generals and admirals are experts and know more than can laymen. That is a dangerous half-truth. There are few professions that cannot learn from laymen: "The fact of the matter is," President Wilson once said, "that almost every profession is pushed forward by the men who do not belong to it and know nothing about it, because they ask the ignorant questions which it would not occur to the professional man to ask at all." He himself had "had a great many of my preconceived conceptions absolutely destroyed by men who had not given half the study to the subject that I myself had given." But if the profession of arms is one that cannot learn from laymen, assuredly it needs to learn from others than its senior members who are approaching retirement. Perhaps the canonization of Herr Hitler as a military genius is premature, but it is worthy of note that Germany's military progress, which no one will say has not been remarkable, is not the achievement of the service hierarchies. They have been drastically reorganized—even purged. Jealousies between the services have been effectively suppressed. An air officer commands infantry and vice versa. The results are plainly visible in Norway, in Holland, and in Flanders. To counteract those results England and France have had to take extreme measures—to have purges of their own. It would have been better to discover the square pegs in round holes before they imperiled national safety.

LINDSAY ROGERS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Canada makes isolation impossible for the United States. Canada makes neutrality a fiction."
—THE OPENING SENTENCES OF:

CANADA: AMERICA'S PROBLEM

by JOHN MacCORMAC
N. Y. Times Canadian Correspondent 1935-39

To what degree does the Monroe Doctrine pledge us to Canada's defense? What if the seat of the British Government moves to Canada — or if Canada seeks to join the U. S.?

THE BOOK ABOUT THE NATION WITH WHOM—COME WHAT MAY —OUR FATE IS MOST CLOSELY LINKED

"A book about one of the most urgent aspects of the overwhelming issues with which we are confronted. I wish that every American would read it."—Walter Millis, *Herald Tribune.*

THE VIKING PRESS $2.75

WHY FARMERS ARE POOR
The Agricultural Crisis in the United States
by Anne Rochester
A fundamental study with special chapters on land and rent, farm wage workers, small and commercial farms, prices and markets, current farm legislative measures and other problems. 2.75

The SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR
by Earl Browder
The Communist candidate for President summarizes the lessons of the war and the historic changes in the world situation. Groupings and currents in America are subjected to a penetrating examination. A basic contribution to the fight for peace. 2.75

Salute to SPRING
And Other Stories
by Meridel Le Sueur
CARL SANDBURG says of this outstanding Midwestern author:
"She is a witness with a genius for moving and highly implicative testimony." 2.00

Dialectics of NATURE
by Frederick Engels
For the first time in English. J. B. S. HALDANE writes in his preface: "It is astonishing how Engels anticipated the progress of science. . . . Had his remarks on Darwinism been generally known, I, for one, would have been saved a certain amount of muddled thinking." 3.00

Send for free catalogue
International Publishers
381 Fourth Avenue, New York

Anatomy of Poland

POLISH PROFILE. By Princess Paul Sapieha. Carrick and Evans. $2.50.

THIS is no profile. Here is Poland itself, skin and ribs laid back and congested organs all exposed to view. "I realized," said Virgilia Petersen of Vassar and New York after she had been married to her Polish prince a year or so, "that boundaries between nations were human boundaries, too. You not only inherited family traits, but also national traits, and you carried this heritage, like a halter around your neck, forever." It is in the cool light of a fine modern American intelligence that she presents the inside of ancient Poland to American eyes.

Hers is a very different Poland from any we have met before. Not the heroic Poland of Paderewski, nor the sentimental Poland of the republic out of Versailles, nor the dictatorial Poland of Marshal Pilsudski, who, after death, was kept *à la* Lenin in a coffin open to public view until his badly embalmed ears began to go to pieces. It is not the cynical Poland of Colonel Beck's monocle, stripped of all illusions except the fatal one that it was as smart as Germany and Germany was its friend; nor, except in the last chapter, the battered Poland of the German *Blitzkrieg* and the Fourth Partition. Here is Poland at home—in a feudal castle, in a peasant's hut, in a cow barn ankle deep in muck, in a Warsaw apartment. This is the way Poland acts and thinks when its doors are shut and its people talk among themselves. Here are the prejudices that move it, and those that keep it from moving. More than its roads are of red mud. Its social attitudes are medieval, its education inadequate, its sanitation clogged or non-existent. Its religion is the dead weight of a Catholicism that, in the words of one of its priests, has had "no opposition to challenge the church here or to make it restate its faith. It has not needed to defend itself, and therefore it has grown soft and easy, and people have slipped into certain abuses which are taken for granted." So at the end the German planes came over, and the Ruthenian peasants stripped the great house of everything that the bombs had left intact. There is no apparent reason to believe that either the house or the peasants will undergo any vital change in Poland's next incarnation.

This is an extraordinary book, written with great economy and an apparent detachment that takes its strength from the depth of emotion controlled under its quiet surface. Gilly Petersen has learned many things besides the ways of Poland in these six years.

MILDRED ADAMS

Adventurous Americans

I MARRIED ADVENTURE. By Osa Johnson. J. B. Lippincott Company. $3.50.

THE Martin Johnsons were not and never pretended to be scientists, though the value of their work was recognized by Carl Akeley and other museum bigwigs. Still less, however, were they mere showmen or money-makers. They were simple people who loved adventure, who loved animals, and who, thanks to a quiet singleness of purpose, must have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lived a very happy life until Martin was killed in the crash of an American air liner. Their story, as Mrs. Johnson here tells it, is almost as interesting for the picture it gives of two happy and likable people as it is for the account of adventures in Borneo, Africa, and the South Seas.

As a mere youth Martin, the son of a small-town jeweler in Kansas, wrote a letter to Jack London which won him a place on the famous cruise of the Snark. When Osa met and married him almost on the spur of the moment, he was showing in his home town some pictures taken on that cruise, and not long afterward she found herself in the Solomon Islands. Chic Sale had loaned them a little money to make a new set of pictures, and from then on they were leaders of increasingly elaborate expeditions which kept them most of the time in one remote region or another. "I Married Adventure" tells the whole story unaffectedly and with a simple charm that is highly engaging. It belongs in any list of Americana, for the Johnsons were as American as David Crockett.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Liberal—Southern Style

TAR HEEL EDITOR. By Josephus Daniels. University of North Carolina Press. $3.50.

IF THE term "liberal" has not been tortured beyond meaning "Southern liberal" has a meaning all its own. Through the seventy-seven years of his life Josephus Daniels has been a champion of freedom, education, justice, democracy. He is entitled to be understood when he calls himself a liberal. It was liberal of him to have been born at all, what with the Civil War raging all around the house there in the little town of Washington, North Carolina. His first thirty-one years, reported with extraordinary faithfulness in "Tar Heel Editor," were lived in a scene which fixed his liberalism with the special circumstance of a region and a history, making some of it easily recognizable to Northerners of the denomination but some not at all. As a boy editor (eighteen years old) of the Wilson, North Carolina, *Advance*, he found his philosophy in a maxim of Samuel Bowles: "No man is living a life that is worth living unless he is willing to die for somebody or something—at least to die a little." Throughout the North Carolina days covered by his book Mr. Daniels was willing to "die a little" for many things—for professional honesty against Louisiana Lottery advertising money, for prohibition of alcoholic liquor (he made his first speech about that), for home rule and the ousting of the carpetbaggers, for morality and the church, for release of North Carolina's government from railroad dominance, for protest against the tobacco trust, for the rights and needs of the farmer, for government by the people, and—most of all—for public education in North Carolina. He was one with Alderman, Aycock, and McIver in that cause, knowing it to be then—as it is now—the long answer to the problems of the South. He was a democrat with a small *d* as well as a big one, but he had, and still has, great pride in his ancestry, in the long residence of his family in the state and in the part it took. And he was as unwilling as most of his fellow-citizens in those days to have an ignorant and irresponsible Negro vote control. He was

Rodzinski Salutes the Tchaikovsky Centennial

"When you hear this recording of Tchaikovsky's Fifth it is like hearing us in person in Severance Hall. The new advance in recording tone-quality is amazing."

DR. ARTUR RODZINSKI
CONDUCTOR, THE CLEVELAND ORCHESTRA

TCHAIKOVSKY'S FIFTH SYMPHONY! Columbia* Masterworks Records salute Tchaikovsky's Centennial with a magnificent recording of this great symphony by Artur Rodzinski and The Cleveland Orchestra. Hear it today. You will agree that this is "The Fifth" as Tchaikovsky would have wanted it played—"The Fifth" as *you* will want it.

Four Tchaikovsky Recordings You Should Own!

New! Symphony No. 5 in E Minor
Artur Rodzinski conducting The Cleveland Orchestra. Five 12-inch records in Album. Set 406 (M, AM, MM) $10.00

New! Quartet in D Major
Roth String Quartet. Four 12-inch records in Album. Set 407 (M, AM, MM) . . $5.50

Nutcracker Suite
Frederick Stock conducting the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. Three 12-inch records in Album. Set 395 (M, AM, MM) . . $5.00

Concerto No. 1 in B-Flat Minor
Egon Petri, pianist, and the London Philharmonic Orchestra. Four 12-inch records in Album. Set 318 (M, AM, MM) . $6.00

COLUMBIA RECORDS Trade Mark

Columbia Recording Corporation • Subsidiary of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. • Bridgeport, New York, Hollywood

*Trade marks "Columbia", the symbol and "Masterworks" Reg. U. S. Pat. Off. by Columbia Phonograph Company, Inc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Great Conference—With Time for Fun

AMERICA, THE WAR AND THE ELECTION

SPEAKERS:

William Green — Marquis W. Childs
John T. Flynn — Dr. Frank Bohn
Henry Hazlitt — Algernon Lee
Robert J. Watt — Louis Waldman
Dr. Merle Vincent — Hon. R. G. Casey
Edward Keating — Bela Low
Henry F. Grady — Emanuel Stein
Rev. Wm. C. Kernan

Plenty of Leisure for Fun: Swimming, Boating, Games, Dancing, A Brilliant Max Liebman Revue on Saturday Night. Send for Folder.

Camp **TAMIMENT**
9 E. 15 ST., N. Y. ALgonquin 4-3441

JUNE 20-23
Special Rates for 3 Full Days
$5 per day or $14 week-end
De Luxe Accommodations Extra
Reservations at Camp Tamiment or at N. Y. Office

QUISISANA CAMPS
On Lake Kezar in Center Lovell, Maine
Located on LAKE KEZAR (considered most beautiful in U. S. A.) in Maine's pine woods and White Mountain Region.
QUAINT • RESTFUL • ROMANTIC • CULTURED COMPANIONSHIP
Cheerful individual cottages with bath, fireplaces, electricity. Main Lodge rooms with or without private bath. Food of highest quality, wholesome, tempting. Golf, tennis, boating, swimming, natural sand beach. Excellent fishing: Salmon, Black Bass, Brook Trout.
Non-sectarian. Ownership-Management.
RATES: From $35.00 a week per person, including meals. WRITE FOR BOOKLET
N. Y. Address, 42 West 35th Street. Telephone WIsconsin 7-0200

LATIN AMERICA

MEXICO: 7 trips. 3 to 4 weeks in Mexico. Prices **$228** to **$541.** More than mere sightseeing. Programs and contacts arranged by a distinguished committee, headed by the Minister of Education.

ECUADOR: A survey. Academic credit available. 1 month. **$330.**

THE OPEN ROAD
12th floor
8 West 40th Street New York

You may order

BOOKS

from THE NATION

At the request of many readers who reside in communities in which no bookshop has been established, *The Nation* offers to deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (postfree) provided payment is received with the order or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

Please address your orders to

THE READERS' SERVICE DIVISION
The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

a champion of most of the things sought by the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist Party, but he was never persuaded to leave the Democratic Party for their sake. He loved freedom and personal liberty, but he never doubted the need of prohibition, and he was a leader in the fight that brought it to Raleigh in the eighties. The American embassy at Mexico City today is bone dry. He was broad-minded, but the nude pictures and statues at the Corcoran Art Gallery shocked him on his first visit to Washington in 1882, and still do. "Although I have visited famous galleries in Europe (since those days)," he writes, "where the female figure is admired most in near nudity, I have never felt that the September Morn type of art, naked female pulchritude, was quite the proper thing, although I do not blush as on my first introduction to it."

There is no literature in Josephus Daniels's book. But there are great honesty, much achievement, an uncrushed idealism, and a complete readability. It is crammed with the history, ways, days, names, and events with which this fine old North Carolinian was associated in the years before he became Cleveland's Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, and Roosevelt's Ambassador to Mexico. The after-years are to be reported in volumes to come, he says.

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES E. NOYES is a staff writer for Editorial Research Reports, a Washington newspaper service.

BARNET NOVER conducts a column on world affairs in the Washington *Post.*

JOHN DEWEY, distinguished philosopher, author, and teacher, has been a powerful and persistent defender of academic freedom.

LINDSAY ROGERS is Burgess professor of public law at Columbia University.

MILDRED ADAMS, translator and journalist, is a frequent contributor to the magazine and book sections of the New York *Times.*

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES is on the editorial staff of the Birmingham *Age-Herald* and is author of "Tonight in the South."

In Early Issues of The Nation

"Health Is Wealth" by Paul de Kruif
REVIEWED BY KARL MENNINGER

"World's End" by Upton Sinclair
REVIEWED BY JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

"Joy of Man's Desiring" by Jean Giono
REVIEWED BY JUSTIN O'BRIEN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DRAMA

Naughty Sixteen-Nineties

THE Players' Club revival of "Love for Love" was scheduled for one week only and will have closed its run before this notice can be printed. But revivals of old plays are so rare in our theater that it is hard to resist the opportunity to talk about one when it does appear—especially if the play happens to be as famous as this. "Love for Love" seemed to Congreve's contemporaries an indisputable masterpiece, bringing to final perfection the style which a whole generation had been polishing, and it ultimately disappeared from the stage chiefly because it was more cynical than a tender-minded society could endure. We are no longer so easily shocked, but the play could hardly become a great favorite again for a different reason: we demand a more continuous dramatic movement and a tighter structure than most plays of the time achieved; and Congreve was conspicuously weak in these respects even by comparison with such a predecessor as Wycherley. He could give to short scenes like that between Tattle and Miss Prue what we call dramatic punch; perhaps because he was lazy, he could not arrange and link these scenes in such a way as to give the effect of continuity and climax.

Robert Edmond Jones, who was responsible both for the charming sets and for the direction of the play, announced in advance that the aim was to produce "a fantasy on a fantasy." Actually, however, the general intention at least seemed to me to achieve something a good deal nearer to the spirit of the original than this would suggest, and such weaknesses as appeared were the result of an inability on the part of some of the actors to catch a style so different from any to which they were accustomed. Nearly all the commentators agreed that Bobby Clark stole the show with his hilarious performance as Ben the sailor and that Dorothy Gish was very nearly as good in the other low-comedy part, that of the willing Miss Prue. Both, indeed, were so delightful as to suggest that they might do wonders in some of the other old plays which give opportunity for virtuoso acting of a sort few modern players are capable of. Dudley Digges also was good as Foresight, the astrologer, but on the whole the men who appeared as the wits and gentlemen were less satisfactory than were the ladies—Violet Heming, Cornelia Otis Skinner, and Peggy Wood—who played opposite them. They sometimes mumbled their lines, and they seldom seemed to me to get precisely the emphasis or intonation necessary if the lines are to mean what Congreve intended.

Let me take a single analyzable example—the rhymed tag at the end of an act which was spoken with the emphasis here indicated:

Women are like tricks by sleight-of-hand
Which to *admire* we should not *understand.*

But this, I submit, ought to be:

Which to admire *we should* not understand.

Congreve's fame was due largely to the fact that he was able to give just the slightest touch of novelty to themes, characters, and jokes which were perfectly familiar, that he could make them seem just a little more subtle and refined. The fact that women are admired but not understood is an old joke. The point of the comparison with tricks of sleight-of-hand is that we, in search of entertainment, seek out the occasion to be deceived. Or as the familiar phrase of the modern advertisement used to proclaim, "It's fun to be fooled." Perhaps this is not very important. But in any event it is pretty much all there is in Congreve, and if you miss that you miss everything.

Few persons have ever succeeded in writing anything about Congreve without making some reference to Charles Lamb's famous contention that the plays of the Restoration cannot be indecent for the simple reason that they are completely unreal, imaging a world which never existed and based upon premises which no one ever really accepted—almost what we would call pure poetry. His assumption, I think, is largely false so far as the founders of the tradition in which Congreve worked are concerned, and only half true when affirmed in connection with Congreve himself. The plays of Etherege and Wycherley, for example, are at least a recognizable picture of a real society and the clear expression of a set of convictions about basic human nature, convictions which include the belief that men and women cannot escape from the fundamental egotism which is born with them and also that, as one of Dryden's serious characters proclaims, "promiscuous love is Nature's general law." Congreve himself wrote at the end of an epoch, and it is true that in his plays the premises are tending to become mere dramatic convention, just as his personages are tending to become exquisite puppets imitating art rather than life. And it is just the resulting ambiguity which makes them hard to describe as well as hard to play. What is matter can never be surely distinguished from what is merely manner. Charles II, so we are told by a contemporary, did not believe that any man was honest or any woman virtuous out of principle. In one of the songs in "Love for Love" Congreve proclaims the truth which an oracle has spoken:

He alone won't betray in whom none will confide,
And the nymph may be chaste that has never been tried.

He is saying with witty ingenuity what Charles had made as a flat statement. Is he really saying the same thing or has it become, in the polished saying, something quite different? Charles spoke only because he believed something. Does Congreve pretend to believe only that he may say something well?

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

RECORDS

AMONG Victor's December and special releases that I was unable to comment on at the time they were issued is Haydn's Symphony No. 104. If you follow the course of the work from point to point in the Tovey manner—for example, from the entire orchestra's forceful opening call in D major to the immediately following D minor whisper of the strings, to mention only the first of the succession of breath-taking details in that powerful slow introduction—you will be inclined to accept

REYNAL & HITCHCOCK
Announce
A PRIZE OF
$2,500
FOR THE BEST
NON-FICTION BOOK
FOR THE GENERAL READER
WRITTEN AND
SUBMITTED BEFORE
SEPTEMBER 1, 1941
BY
A MEMBER OF
AN AMERICAN
COLLEGE FACULTY
Write at once for brochure giving full details. Address Reynal & Hitchcock, 386 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tovey's estimate of the work as one of Haydn's two or three greatest. It is, nevertheless, rarely played, and has long been in need of a good recording. Not yet issued here by Columbia is the one made by Beecham, which will offer the work with his individual, dynamic phrasing and with the beautiful and imposing sonorities of his London Philharmonic. The Victor set (M-617, $5) made by Edwin Fischer with his chamber orchestra, on the other hand, offers a performance not only superb in musical outline, warmth, spirit, force, but enchanting in the way an ensemble performance by a small group of fine musicians can be—in the sensitiveness and fluidity of the perfectly coordinated functioning of the group, the balance of the instrumental lines, the blending of their colors and sonorities.

These things are achieved to the same enchanting degree by the coordinated functioning of Landowska's ten fingers in the polyphony of Handel's Suites Nos. 2, 5 (with the variations known by the title "Harmonious Blacksmith"), 7 (with the famous Passacaglia), 10, and 14 (M-592, $12). There are dull pages mingled with superb ones in these works; but the dullest passage has the exciting life that her fingers impart to it with their subtle inflection. By the evidence of these performances Landowska has no equal among players of the harpsichord, and only few equals among living musicians.

Lotte Lehmann's voice, her musical feeling, her dramatic imagination and temperament make her not only one of the supreme operatic artists of our time but also a deeply affecting singer of German *Lieder*—as one may hear in her singing of "Auf ein altes Bild," "Heimweh," and "Auch kleine Dinge" in her set of Hugo Wolf songs (M-613, $5). The emotional content of each of these songs is concentrated into a structure of tone and rhythm created by the vocal line and piano accompaniment; and for the most part Lehmann's interpretative equipment of voice, feeling, imagination, temperament is concentrated into the subtle coloring and accentuation of this vocal line within the tonal and rhythmic framework. In these records one hears only a few slight instances—for example, the words *falsch, aber, fort* of "Heimweh"—of the sharp audible intake of breath, the gasp, the dramatic whisper that are considered to be, like movement and gesture, more properly part of the means of the opera stage; only at the end of "Peregrina No. 1" is there an example of the emotional intensity that sometimes bursts through the tonal and rhythmic framework of a song; and here and there in "In der Frühe" one hears a few of Lehmann's constricted, shrill high notes. As for the songs themselves, I do not care much for "Peregrina" and "Frühling übers Jahr"; but the others are among Wolf's best.

Act III of "Die Meistersinger" contains passages that are among Wagner's finest, and that normally one begins to hear with ears and mind dulled by two hours and a half of the preceding acts. The Victor recording (the scenes in Sachs's workshop: M-537, $20; the scene on the banks of the Pegnitz: M-538, $10) enables one to listen to this music fresh and alert, to repeat a passage as many times as one likes, and in these ways to become aware of details one normally misses. This makes the set valuable despite its defects. Not only does a recording let one hear an opera under more favorable conditions than in the opera house; it can let one hear the opera sung as it normally is not sung in an opera house—sung, that is, by good singers assembled from different opera houses; but this "Meistersinger" set was made with the singers, good and bad, of the Dresden Opera. The Walther, the David, the Beckmesser are good or good enough; but in place of the fine voices, the finished singing, the sensitive phrasing of Schorr, Rethbergfi and Elisabeth Schumann on the old Victor records of "Wahn! Wahn," the Sachs-Eva duet, and the Quintet, the present set offers the rough voice and explosive singing of Hans Hermann Nissen as Sachs, the thin, shrill voice and the singing without musical significance of Margarete Teschemacher as Eva. Nor is the recording as good as it should be. There is better balance and clarity of the voices on the old record of the Quintet; in the new set there is again the defect of singers, apparently too close to the microphones, obscuring the fine orchestra; and the orchestral passage at Beckmesser's departure from Sachs's workshop is only the worst of the places where no amount of repetition—now with one type of needle, now with another, now with treble increased, now with treble reduced—gives anything but gritty sound. These are imperfections which I am bound to report; but I am bound also to add that they will not prevent the person who loves this music from enjoying it.

There are still a few releases that I will deal with later; and I will comment on the Victor Black Label Classics next week.

B. H. HAGGIN

HAY-ADAMS HOUSE

In hospitality, charm and dignity as well as service and cuisine, the Hay-Adams House perpetuates these two great names. An ideal location, directly opposite the White House, overlooking beautiful LaFayette Park. Write for free "Guide to Washington."

From $3.50 Single $5. Double

Completely Air Conditioned

SIXTEENTH STREET AT H

WASHINGTON D.C.

LANGUAGES

NOW LEARN A NEW LANGUAGE

in your own home quickly, easily, correctly by the world-famous LINGUAPHONE Method. Endorsed by thousands of students, schools and colleges.

SEND FOR FREE BOOK

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE

81 R. C. A. BUILDING NEW YORK CITY

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. All makes. We sell, rent, purchase, exchange, Mail Orders. Booklet N. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, N. Y. C.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

Handwriting scientifically analyzed. Detailed, sincere, helpful. $3. Questions answered. Send 15 pen-written lines. State age, sex. Dr. Alfred Reiss, Ph.D. Formerly Heidelberg. 1775 Broadway, N. Y. City.

BOOK

IT IS YOUR LIFE

Keep Healthy ● Stay Young ● Live Long

By M. M. Rosenberg, M.D.

"It is the best book of its kind in years." Benjamin DeCasseres in his "March of Events."

23 Chapters, 475 pages, illustrated—price $2.50

SCHOLASTIC BOOK PRESS

158 E. 22nd St., New York Or Your Bookseller

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price, 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, 50 cents. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Dramatic Index, Index to Labor Periodicals, Public Affairs Information Service. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED